



## Trans-Lake Washington Project

May 22, 2002

### Montlake Community Design Workshop – Executive Summary

A community design workshop for the Montlake neighborhood was held on May 22, 2002, from 6:30 until 9:00 p.m. at St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church. The purpose of the workshop was to address issues raised at the April 26, 2002, workshop, update the community on the status of the Trans-Lake Washington Project, and to solicit community feedback on the following issues:

- interchange options for 6- and 8-lane alternatives;
- potential lid locations with interchange options;
- proposed transportation demand management program; and
- transit modeling assumptions.

Over fifty people attended the workshop. For a list of participants and project team in attendance, please see Appendix C. Invitees were selected based on the proximity of their business, property, or residence to the SR 520 corridor. Approximately forty invitations were distributed electronically or by mail. Selected invitees were contacted by phone the day prior to the workshop to remind them of the event. A workshop announcement was also placed on the Montlake community website.

After the introduction of the project team, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation, Sound Transit, and consultants, participants were provided a report of the project's status and objectives for the workshop. This was followed by a general question and answer period. Workshop participants then broke into smaller groups and were directed to three project-sponsored working stations and one special interest station. Each project-sponsored working station focused around one of the major issues and was staffed by project team members. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and give feedback on the issues by talking with staff, marking on existing interchange diagrams, and filling out comment forms.

Major themes resulting from the general discussion, workstation sessions, and written comments, were as follows:

- ✓ Attendees asked the project team to provide information on the height of the braided ramps above the water.
- ✓ The project team will verify whether the Montlake Bridge is listed on the state or federal historic register.
- ✓ Proponents of the neighborhood transportation committee alternative requested a dialogue with the project team to investigate the feasibility of this alternative.
- ✓ Participants would like the project team to return with cost estimates for the alternatives and associated improvements.
- ✓ Some participants would like the project team to educate the public on all factors contributing to slow travel times across Lake Washington, which includes the I-5 and I-405 interchanges.



## **Trans-Lake Washington Project**

**May 22, 2002**

- ✓ Some participants would like to see more care given to pedestrian safety with improved intersections and reduced speeds of travel.
- ✓ In general, participants would like to see efforts made to retain individuality of the Montlake community.
- ✓ Some participants would like to see perspectives of the 8-lane, Option L from Lake Washington Boulevard.
- ✓ In general, participants did not support the 8-lane interchange option L.
- ✓ Participants requested information as to what will be done with freed right-of-way land, if the alignment in the Arboretum or other places along SR 520 is straightened. Most suggested the land be made into greenspace.
- ✓ Most participants were supportive of east-west HOV/BRT access to a central location for buses.

## Montlake Community Design Workshop – Summary

### Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Objectives

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, introduced the project team to the community, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and Sound Transit (ST).

The purpose of the community design workshop was to address issues raised at the April 26, 2002 workshop, update the community on the status of the Trans-Lake Washington Project, and to obtain input from the community regarding unresolved design issues. The format of the workshop was as follows:

- Progress report on interchange options for 6- and 8-lane alternatives
- General question and answer session
- Roundtable workshop session to provide feedback on drawings and maps

### Project Status Update

Les Rubstello, WSDOT, related that the project team members present at the workshop are those responsible for designing the interchanges for each of the project's alternatives. Input was sought from workshop participants, specifically on the 6- and 8-lane alternatives.

The project is directed by the 22-member Executive Committee, which includes four Seattle representatives. The Executive Committee recommended to WSDOT and Sound Transit that a 4-lane, 6-lane, and 8-lane alternative, proceed into the environmental impact statement (EIS). In addition to examining the three alternatives, a "no action" alternative will also be considered in the EIS. Each will be analyzed as separate alternatives and its impacts disclosed. The EIS does not take funding into account and therefore does not guarantee that there is money to eventually build the project.

The current funding for the project will be spent between now and December 2002. Both the statewide vote in November 2002 and a regional vote within the next year will determine future project funding. If both pass within the next year, the floating bridge could be constructed as early as 2006. However, the limited funding available between now and the end of the year may prevent the project team from beginning to write the EIS until 2003.

### General Discussion

The following comments and questions have been listed by subject categories, not in the order raised by attendees.

#### High-Capacity Transit (HCT)

- Explain the decision of the Executive Committee regarding high-capacity transit (HCT). *In January 2002, the Executive Committee decided that the first time HCT*

*crosses Lake Washington should be on I-90. However, HCT on I-90 would go through Bellevue to SR 520 and extend into Redmond. A minority of committee members favored the placement of HCT on SR 520. A compromise was reached to build the SR 520 corridor, so it can accommodate a second crossing of HCT in the future. WSDOT recognizes that this type of planning is always difficult because there is the possibility that rail may not work in the future, depending on variables, such as rail car size changing.*

- *What guarantees that the future widening of SR 520 would not impact the Hamlin-Shelby neighborhood? This type of assessment would involve an entirely new environmental process, not part of this project. Today, the project team can sketch out the addition of HCT without taking any homes. However, no one is designing the route today, so no one has ownership over this decision and there are no guarantees. We are designing the bridge with today's technology in mind. Since there is not definition for a light rail route, no one knows for sure where it will go. Currently, there are no plans to expand the footprint on the west or east side of the corridor. The addition of HCT is something that would happen decades out.*
- *Is there a plan to convert the extra space into lanes? There is no plan to use the new bridge width for anything but HCT.*
- *Planning for HCT is planning for the future. HCT may not happen, but at least this opportunity is not forgone. Consideration for the neighborhood will be as high, if not higher, than it is now.*

### Cost

- *Provide us with ballpark figures for each of the alternatives. WSDOT has been asked by formulators of the regional vote to provide project costs. The project is not ready to provide this information tonight. The numbers are planned for release in approximately two weeks and will be covered in the media.*

### Mitigation

- *What is the cost of mitigation of traffic jams – delays across the bridge, delays on Montlake? How much mitigation do we get out of this? The 4-, 6-, and 8-lane alternatives are being compared to the “no action” alternative. The 6- and 8-lane options make the corridor operate better than before, so there will be no mitigation on the freeway because the widening increases traffic flow. There will be increases in traffic on the side streets, which the project will mitigate. Presently, the project is looking at 160 or 170 intersections – some as far north as 45<sup>th</sup> Street. The project looks at all of these with each alternative, including no-action. The goal is to fix things to go back to a state as if “no action” occurred. In the City of Seattle mitigation is a challenge because everything is built out.*

### Traffic

- *How much improvement will there be on SR 520? This will be disclosed in the EIS. The traffic report last spring, Multimodal Alternative Evaluation Report [April], will be available online shortly. There is an approximately 15 minute improvement, with a 30 minute saving for HOVs, from east I-405 to I-5.*
- *How far south are you looking at intersections? Boyer or Madison. The farthest west on Pacific Avenue is over to 15<sup>th</sup> and north to 45<sup>th</sup> Street. On Lake Washington Blvd, the project is looking as far as the four-way stop at the*

*Arboretum, but not down to Madison. If the project discovers that there is a significant increase, than more intersections farther away will be evaluated.*

- *How are you planning to quantify the level of service at the intersections? The project is using a sincro-analysis tool to evaluate the level of service at the intersections. This is a preliminary evaluation. If impacts result from this evaluation, the study may be expanded.*

### Alternatives

- *Is there an option between 4-lane and “no action” alternatives? No. This was discussed early in the process. There was a minimum footprint alternative. The primary reason this is not being pursued is because of WSDOT’s insistence on shoulders. The new 4-lane alternative is just four feet shy of doubling the existing width.*
- *Most of the communities support the minimum footprint alternative. We are looking at 10-foot shoulders. This looks like a future lane conversion by the people in this area. How will you overcome this perception? WSDOT has a standard manual that is followed. Ten-foot shoulders are a standard design requirement, if there are three lanes in either direction. The shoulders allow enough room for a car to get off, but they are not so wide to be used as lanes. The City of Seattle is a player in decisions on both I-90 and SR 520. It would be unlikely that WSDOT would re-stripe over the resistance of the City of Seattle. The re-stripe being considered on I-90 is a tough decision and has been debated for over three years. The existing shoulders save lives, but there is also a benefit to be gained by the addition of a HOV lane. When I-90 was completed in 1976 there was a memorandum agreement between Mercer Island, City of Seattle, City of Bellevue, and King County. It is still in effect today. Something similar will be done for SR 520.*
- *I am not sure our elected officials would not agree to a re-stripe. Is the standard of 10-foot shoulders a state or federal requirement? SR 520 is a “state route,” so it follows State of Washington standards.*
- *The public may have standing to sue, if there were an attempt to convert the shoulders to lanes. I am untrusting of legislators. WSDOT has consulted the attorney general regarding this project as with the I-90 Two Way Transit project. The current understanding is that converting shoulders to lanes is an activity that requires an independent EIS. WSDOT’s current practice is to not make these decisions unilaterally.*

### **Progress on Interchange Options and Related Design Issues**

Since meeting with the Montlake community in March 2002, the project team has continued to define the interchanges. The interchange options brought to the workshop reflect consultation with the appropriate agencies, including the Washington Department of Ecology, Army Corps of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, and Washington State Fish & Wildlife, and the community. In addition to providing feedback on the interchanges, the project team is asking the community for input on the placement of lids with regards to each of the interchange options.

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, discussed the interchange options. He acknowledged that there was no graphic to represent the 4-lane alternative at the workshop because vehicle capacity is not being added. There is only the addition of shoulders and a

bicycle/pedestrian pathway. Interchange improvements are not a part of the 4-lane alternative. Jeff spoke to the progress on the following interchange options:

- 6-lane, Option I: Full direction interchange (ramps serving all directions) at Montlake Blvd, and east connections at Lake Washington Blvd, similar to existing conditions. This option is also proposing an additional four-foot buffer between general purpose (GP) and HOV lanes. This concept has been modified significantly since hearing from the neighborhoods. The bus stops on the outside will be moved into the center (as a major transfer point, so buses going both directions can pull out of HOV lanes). The project continues to explore this option. The engineering and environmental team will recommend that this interchange move forward into the EIS.
- 6-lane, Option M: Similar to Option I, with modified Montlake bascule bridge; either a new, wider bridge or a parallel bridge east or west of the existing bridge; and braided HOV direct connections to and from SR 520. The project was directed by the Executive Committee to consider an alternative that does not provide additional capacity across the cut, and this alternative meets that direction.
- 8-lane, Option L: Full direction interchange at Montlake Blvd; tunnel under the Montlake Cut; east connections at Lake Washington Blvd relocated to the vicinity of MOHAI; and HOV direct connections to the tunnel. The 8-lane option adds a HOV lane and GP lane in each direction the full length of the corridor. The existing Montlake corridor cannot handle the additional demand, so this alternative provides a second crossing of the cut into the Pacific/Montlake area. It keeps traffic out of the Montlake Blvd corridor and keeps traffic to and from the University running efficiently. The basic geometry of the existing interchange does not change. The project team recognizes the proximity to Lake Washington Blvd and is working on improving it. We are also beginning to layout stormwater facilities.

Jonathan Dubman, Montlake resident, spoke to an alternative that emerged from a neighborhood transportation committee. The community recognizes that there would be significant engineering and political challenges associated with this alternative. The alternative involves the construction of a bored tunnel from Foster Island to I-5/Mercer, with a tunneled branch to Pacific Street, a corridor that fairly closely parallels where Sound Transit is proposing its own bored tunnel. They suggest the tunnel be constructed in a phased fashion, after reconstruction of the floating bridge, while the existing corridor is fully operational. After the tunnel is opened, the Portage Bay viaduct and Montlake interchange could be removed. Some members of the community feel that this alternative has the potential to address transportation needs while providing an enormous benefit to the environment and quality of life in Seattle, and freeing the existing right-of-way for other uses. At the same time, they are aware that the alternative would be very expensive, requiring a substantial ventilation infrastructure and imposing other impacts at the portals.

## General Discussion

The following comments and questions have been listed by subject categories, not in the order raised by attendees.

### 4-lane Alternative

- What will the width of the 4-lane roadway be, including current standards and the bicycle/pedestrian lane? *96 feet.*
- Would you build the full 96 feet to the north? *The alignment will be pushed north to straighten the roadway and improve overall safety.*
- Does the 4-lane alternative add some capacity? *There is an incremental gain because the full width shoulders improve safety, reliability, and flow of traffic.*
- I understand your rationale, but I do not believe it. The current bridge only takes 1,600 vehicles per hour. A new 4-lane bridge would be an increase of 30% capacity. *The shoulder width is inhibiting the figures. Interchanges play into it.*
- I don't think the gain resulting from the 6- or 8-lane alternative would not be gained from 4-lanes. Users of the corridor need to be aware that it is not just the number of lanes inhibiting their journey – it is also the interchanges. The mentality is that more lanes are faster. I would like this to be discussed at future Advisory Committee meetings.
- Regarding traffic flow, does this include intersection improvements? *The basic 4-lane alternative does not change the geometry.*
- Are improvements to surface streets assumed when evaluating the 4-lane alternative? *With the 4-lane alternative, there will be no improvements to surface streets.*
- Does the 4-lane alternative assume certain intersection improvements that are assumed with 6 and 8 lanes? *Yes, it will be in the scope of the project to rebuild the overcrossings at Montlake and make minor improvements to the intersections, specifically to the terminus at each ramp.*
- When you go from 4 to 6 lanes, you have added throughput, but not necessarily more traffic getting on and off at Montlake. *We are making improvements at interchanges to improve access with the 6-lane alternative.*

### 6-lane, Option I

- What is the rationale for including a buffer in a design to minimize right-of-way? *To improve mobility in the corridor by providing high quality bus rapid transit (BRT) service in the SR 520 corridor in concert with HCT in the I-90 corridor. A buffer of four feet is required to provide reliable travel.*
- Is access east and west from Montlake Blvd remaining? *Yes, and it will be improved.*
- Will the exits be widened from Montlake Blvd? *Yes, the median will be narrowed to accommodate, but no trees will be taken.*
- Regarding Lake Washington Blvd, will there be HOV access onto ramps? I believe current state standards require ramps to have provisions for HOV access. *There will be no HOV access on the ramps, and the project is not aware of this standard.*

#### 6-lane, Option M

- Would the twin bridge add more lanes to Montlake Blvd? *There would be HOV lanes up to and across the bridge added to Montlake Blvd.*
- What would be the impact along Montlake? *This detail will be described in the EIS.*
- How high above the water would the braided ramps be? *The project team will obtain this information.*
- The traffic flow across the Montlake Bridge is fine. The intersections to the north and south of the bridge are the real problem. Widening the Montlake Bridge alone would not help. What is the need? *We are providing for an HOV lane across the bridge and through the existing intersections.*
- Why speed up the bridge, if the intersections are crowded? *Adding HOV lanes will provide for more capacity for people through the intersection and over the bridge. For every bus, there are several cars. We are providing an HOV lane.*
- Please verify whether or not the Montlake Bridge is on the state or federal historic register. *Listing on the register does not necessarily preclude removing it; however, documentation regarding any change will be very thorough.*
- Will the HOV lanes be 2-or 3-person? The 3-person HOV lanes are empty. *Three plus. We feel that by the time the project is built, a 2-person lane will be just as crowded as a general-purpose lane.*
- Are you assuming that the speed will increase on Montlake Blvd? *The flow would be more efficient. There would also be the addition of signals.*
- I am concerned about pedestrian safety.
- Where are the HOV lanes on Montlake Blvd going to be located? *There is enough width in the existing right-of-way to accommodate the lanes, which would be built north of SR 520 only.*
- There was a university area transportation study, which included the Montlake area. It recommended an additional HOV lane off SR 520 into the University of Washington. There is also the possibility of widening the boulevard north of the bridge. Could we widen for HOV and at the same time protect the Montlake community from impacts? The Montlake Bridge is also in need of improvements.
- I do not want Montlake to become a highway. I do not want the bridge to be sacrificed. It is a beautiful bridge. I would chain myself to the bridge, if necessary. Do not underestimate the solidarity of this community.
- This alternative needs to be rethought – rather than use a horrible alternative that will make things a hundred times more horrible. I am worried that Seattle will consume the area and not leave a place for nature and history. This is symbolic of the direction we are headed.

#### 8-lane, Option L

- Please explain why people have objected to a tunnel. *In order to provide a tunnel, the elevation of the highway would need to be raised 24 feet. There are ventilation and grade issues in addition to higher costs.*
- Why not a tunnel for 6 lanes? *It is a challenge. For 8 lanes, the traffic analysis shows that a new connection is required to maintain adequate levels of service on SR 520. For 6 lanes, traffic analysis does not show sufficient benefit to warrant the high cost of the tunnel.*



- How steep by comparison is 24<sup>th</sup> Street up Capitol Hill? *5 percent.*
- Is there any merit to moving the interchanges east? *The project came up with an alternative that functioned from a traffic flow perspective; however, there were huge impacts and it was dropped.*

### General

- What is the width of the existing roadway? *Varies, but generally 55 feet.*
- Will you be keeping the old floating bridge? *There is not much more than 20 years left in the bridge. There is little probability of building a new bridge and leaving the existing bridge in place.*
- Is there a limit to the width of the floating bridge? *There is not a physical constraint, but eventually it is cost effective to limit the width of the bridge.*
- Why is the speed of traffic increasing? I was told that the speed limit would be raised to 60 miles per hour (mph). Why not 50 or 55 mph? *Engineers look at 10 mph over, so we are looking at 60 mph, and the difference between 60 and 70 mph. There is a negligible difference in the geometry requirement from 50 to 60 mph. WSDOT is working with the City of Seattle on this issue.*
- Would a 12-foot bike lane continue at grade with a wider intersection? *Yes. The project is challenged to continue without the same width in Montlake.*
- Montlake opposes anything that adds traffic to the neighborhood.
- Why does a HOV lane need its own shoulder? I believe the WSDOT guidelines provide flexibility that the project team can work with. It does not seem that enough attention has been paid to the minimum footprint.
- Are you assuming on 6 and 8 lanes that there would be limited capacity at I-5 and I-405? *The project assumes changes at I-5 and I-405. Regarding the 6-lane alternative, the HOV lane going to I-5 would go into the express lanes. It would merge with regular traffic, if the express lanes were not open. There is proposed HOV direct access in three of the four quadrants of intersections at I-405.*
- A new freeway will be almost twice as loud. Mitigation can only do so much.

Following the general discussion, the group broke into the following workstations for the remainder of the workshop: 6-lane, Interchange Option I; 6-lane, Interchange Option M; 8-lane, Interchange Option L; and TDM and transit. Each station contained maps and drawings of the Montlake community and was staffed by project team members who answered questions and recorded comments. There was also a fifth station dedicated to the neighborhood transportation committee alternative. For a full list of recorded comments at each workstation, see Appendix A.

### **Closing**

The project team is committed to return to the community to respond to the issues raised in the discussions. The summary will be made available on the Trans-Lake Washington Project website, as well as e-mailed to those who have provided their e-mail address.

For written comments, not part of the workshop dialogue, please see Appendix B.



## Appendix

## Appendix A, Workstation Questions and Comments

### Workstation #1: 6-lane, Interchange Option I

- Why is there no flyover HOV lane in this alternative?
- University of Washington off-ramp makes sense.
- Provide a tunnel with all options.
- Improve access to the UW and to I-5.
- Prefer 4-lane alternative with shoulders.
- Enforce the HOV 3-person requirement.
- Will the lid cover the off-ramp on the north side of 520?
- Is there still a pedestrian/bike trail in this option?
- Describe changes to the one-way by Louisa Street (south side of bridge, west of Lake Washington Blvd.)

### Workstation #2: 6-lane, Interchange Option M

- Does building a new bridge take away homes?
- What is the lifespan of the Montlake Bridge? How often does it have to be rebuilt?
- Do an additional cost analysis for the Montlake Bridge.
- Describe the compensation for the decrease in home value resulting from the Montlake Bridge expansion.
- Would the western expansion of the Montlake Bridge impact the new UW Medical Surgery Building being built?
- Supportive of tunnel to Pacific.
- State the issues/viability of expanding the Montlake Bridge without building a new structure.
- Provide explanation of impacts on local streets for the expansion of the 6- or 8-lane alternatives.
- What is the possibility of an HOV lane changing into a GP lane?
- Will the SR 520 Portage Bay span be higher than it is currently?
- What are the possibilities of removing the Lake Washington Boulevard on and off ramps?
- List any substantive differences in traffic west of Lake Washington Boulevard.
- Detail specific impacts with providing Montlake intersection access at Lake Washington Boulevard?
- Describe what happens to the land under the 'ramps to nowhere,' if ramps are removed.
- Consider partial lids. A lid east of the Montlake Bridge would better serve the Montlake residents.
- Are noise walls proposed on both sides of SR 520 east of Montlake Boulevard?
- Bring the bicycle/pedestrian trail on top of a lid (referring to the Arboretum trail connecting north of SR-520).
- Provide a key junction with synchronizing lights for buses to improve mobility.

### Workstation #3: 8-lane, Interchange Option L

- Prefer interchange is moved east.
- Noise is already a problem.
- Further investigate noise wall potential. There are environmental versus neighborhood concerns.
- Propose a u-turn limitation?
- Explain what it would take to come up at grade.
- Show perspective of views from Lake Washington Boulevard.
- Who wants this option? Is it being done for the sake of being done?
- Provide traffic measurements (north-south, east-west) over the bridge. If not, measure.
- Explain environmental concerns associated with bringing the intersection/tunnel farther east.
- Can the freeway be lowered at the intersection/tunnel?
- Consider an at-grade freeway above.
- Conduct a needs assessment for tunnel traffic to go west.
- List impacts to foot traffic at above/below ground transitions.
- Tunnel makes most sense because N -> 520 or 520 -> N.
- Consider performing computer modeling of the at-grade option.
- Consider permanent environmental impacts.
- Provide greenspace at Montlake Boulevard and the SR 520 covered area?
- Extend the lid farther.
- What about ventilation and other lid/tunnel concerns?
- Can the same results be achieved by going underneath SR 520 and coming out to connect with Montlake Boulevard versus the proposed tunnel?
- Provide height information regarding the bridge and drawbridge options.
- Consider a 6-lane/bridge combo?
- Provide bus access and flyer stops at the center (Montlake Boulevard and SR 520). It makes sense.

### Workstation #4: TDM and Transit

- Provide a TDM-only alternative.

## Appendix B, Written Comments

### Comment Form Format

#### 6-Lane

1. Please share your thoughts on interchange Option I: Full direction interchange at Montlake Blvd and east connections at Lake Washington Blvd, similar to existing conditions.
2. Please Share your thoughts on interchange Option M: Similar to Option I, with modified Montlake bascule bridge, wither a new wider bridge or a parallel bridge east or west of existing, and braided HOV direct connections to and from SR 520.

#### 8-Lane

1. Please share your thoughts on interchange Option L: Full direction interchange at Montlake Blvd, tunnel under the Montlake Cut, east connections at Lake Washington Blvd relocated to vicinity of MOHAI, and HOV direct connections to tunnel.

#### Potential Lid Location

1. Please comment on potential lid locations with interchange Option I.
2. Please comment on potential lid locations with interchange Option M.
3. Please comment on potential lid locations with interchange Option L.

Please provide feedback on the proposed transportation demand management program (TDM) and transit modeling assumptions.

#### Other Comments

---

#### Comment # 1

##### 6-Lane

1. Does not address getting transit on/off the bridge. More options would need to be presented.
2. Doing nothing to the bridge appears preferable to enhancement, due to the fact that it will still have to open for ship traffic. Limited benefits vs. a serious interruption to flow by design.

##### 8-Lane

2. The tunnel option is a very poor option due to the fact that the mainline grade will rise significantly.

#### Other Comments?

Must Consider a Bored Alignment with Sound Transit

---

#### Comment # 2

##### 6-Lane

1. This option is the ultimate extension of a bad plan to a disastrous plan.

---

#### Comment # 3

##### 6-Lane

2. Braided connections are efficient but very ugly! We need to just re-configure the existing bridge and (structurally and mechanically) to add a southbound HOV lane. (Northbound HOV is unnecessary).

### 8-Lane

1. No 8-lane ever!

### Other Comments

Leave the SR 520 roadway along from where the bridge meets the shoreline. Add bus-only lanes to the bridge and run electrified buses in a bored tunnel direct to downtown and connect to the downtown bus tunnel.

---

### *Comment # 4*

#### 6-Lane

1. I prefer the 4-lane because I agree it may be smoothest given the intersection and exit issues. For the 6-lane, I'd like to see the following changes considered: (1) reconfigure flyer stops (use signaling if necessary to allow buses shorter ramps), stagger them for less width, (2) lid is important – please include, (3) consider saving more width – maybe no extra 4ft through residential area, or move shoulder between HOV and GP or similar creative solutions. (4) just route bikes over Hamlin St. so less property encroachment.
2. Don't like this option – we need to protect Montlake Bridge and the Blvd from widening. Buses getting through to the University isn't going to offset the awful bottleneck on Montlake. Would it be possible to use a "jump queue" signal to let them pass instead? (combined with HOV lane leading up to the bridge). The cars will get bottlenecked after the bridge anyway.

#### 8-Lane

1. Hard to understand why this option is still being considered other than the political need to have an 8-lane option. Too many engineering challenges, awful impact to the neighborhood, and not clear enough benefit. Raising the highway will be disgusting to the whole arboretum area.

### Potential Lid Locations

1. Please consider a longer lid to mitigate the "trumpet" effect right in the middle of residential. Please go beyond minimum requirements for ventilation at the bus stop – it shouldn't be a health hazard to take the bus!
2. Same as above

### Feedback on TDM and transit modeling assumptions

Why don't we move the HOV to the middle today east of the bridge? Especially east of I-405 where buses often get stuck. The bus stops between I-405 and the bridge get very little usage, so could go with express versus local lines where express buses don't stop at those (so no weave). I take the bus to work everyday and it is rare that people use those stops based on what I've observed.

### Other Comments

I LOVE the bored tunnel alternative proposed by Jonathan Dubman. Please, please give it serious consideration. It's the first time I saw something where the billions we're spending makes the city better and potential synergy with rail is compelling.

---

### *Comment # 5*

#### 6-Lane

1. Seems to be the best solution to me, though I wonder if it will really solve traffic problems on the long-term.
2. Strongly dislike! This option has a very serious impact on the community around the bridge and turns one of Seattle's most charming landmark neighborhoods into another generic freeway system. What about a combination tunnel/6-lane option?

#### 8-Lane

1. I have very mixed feelings about this. I like the tunnel plan but dislike the resulting need to raise part of SR 520 25 feet. Very concerned about increased noise from 8 lanes!

#### Potential Lid Locations

Don't know enough about lid locations to comment.

---

### *Comment # 6*

#### Other Comments

Reconfigure the Montlake Bridge to move the structure up about 5" to minimize openings. (Leave roadway elevation alone) [Accompanied by drawing]

---

### *Comment # 7*

#### 6-Lane

1. Don't know what option I is – if you build 6 lanes make the additional lanes only for HOV. People need carrots and sticks to get out of their SOVs and SUVs!!!
2. Widen Montlake Bridge to 3 lanes each way. The road on either side can easily accommodate this. Rebuild the bridge to look as it does now for aesthetics. Make the right lane each direction designated for traffic to and from 520. Building another bridge or tunnel is absurdly costly as an alternative let alone disaster environmentally and aesthetically.

#### 8-Lane

1. You are absolutely daft, if you think there is any evidence that adding more and more concrete to SR 520 will improve transit times around Seattle, given that I-5 and I-405 are all ready parking lots much of the day. Get real. Wake up. Get out on the roads yourselves and see!

#### Potential Lid Locations

1. Lid SR 520 from Montlake Blvd to Park St. at the current level of those streets and make a park. Don't tell us how you can't do it.

#### Other Comments

Hopefully voters will have the sense not to fund any of these projects to build more roads to sit still on. It's time to wake up and fund rapid transit, buses, bikes only, for new construction!

---



*Comment # 8*  
Other Comments

Please put the Capitol Hill tunnel option in the EIS. It is the only bold suggestion yet proposed to solve out interchange problems in Seattle.

---

*Comment # 9*  
6-Lane

2. Look at whether the bridge, by cantilevering the sidewalks, could handle 5 lanes – with the 3 lanes south and to address HOV and an advance signal for the right lane (HOV) of the northbound to let them on the bridge first (assist their weave onto the bridge) This is where the biggest congestions is.
- 

*Comment # 10*  
6-Lane

1. Looks good if you can keep within the existing right of way.
2. Use existing space to create 6 lanes – keep speeds low – don't create highway on Montlake Blvd.

8-Lane

1. No way.

Potential Lid Locations

1. Lid as much as possible

Other Comments

Look at the new tunnel option to Mercer St.

---

*Comment # 11*  
Other Comments

Please have a Montlake Club meeting to explain the bored tunnel option! (the last one presented)

---

*Comment # 12*  
6-Lane

1. Why do a new bridge without HOV options? Doesn't make sense.
2. Modify with car. Probably the best of these options, if integrity of bridge and neighborhood can be observed. Still this option way below bored tunnel option.

8-Lane

1. Hard to understand why this option is still being considered other than the political need to have an 8-lane option. Too many engineering challenges, awful impact to the neighborhood, and not clear enough benefit. Raising the highway will be disgusting to the whole arboretum area.

Potential Lid Locations

1. No way.

## Other Comments

We must consider bored tunnel option!

---

### *Comment # 13*

#### 6-Lane

1. There is no palatable or reasonable ROI option being proposed. We are pouring more money into a poor system at cost to the environment, homeowners, charm and beauty of urban Seattle. In this sense, the only way as a taxpayer I would accept moving with 520 is to modernize the existing structure (i.e. seismic reinforcement, addition of shoulders). Feel free to call me for more feedback if you like M. Park 1833 E. Shelby St. 206-709-1833

#### Potential Lid Locations

1. The bigger the better (i.e. larger coverage for noise mitigation) so long as this is not at cost of increased concentration of air pollution.
2. No Option M please.
3. Same as above.

#### Feedback on TDM and transit modeling assumptions

Flawed: (1) I-405 and I-5 problems will bottleneck any improvements to SR 520. (2) Signals are not well controlled in Seattle. If they were sensor driven as it is in Bell. Traffic would flow much better.

## Other Comments

Why aren't you considering really high volume people movement options such as a train from eastside to Seattle rather than these short sighted and costly band-aids to an already broken model?! Forget HOV for carpools and buses – build in hi-speed trains/subways we need to invest in BART-type solutions, not perpetuation of existing problems.

---

### *Comment # 14*

#### 6-Lane

1. Of all the options it appears this would be the most acceptable to the impacted community. However alternative #5 (Dubman) might be a better option yet! There is a need to formally explore this further.
2. This option is not acceptable to those constituents and residents of Montlake who have consistently objected to any proposal that would significantly increase traffic in this Montlake corridor. Imagine...a six-lane highway with HOV lane running through this community and neighborhood!! Every alternative, except this, has strained to minimally impact households and families. This does not! We do not want a highway running through our community.

#### 8-Lane

1. Not an acceptable proposal.

#### Potential Lid Locations

1. Expand to maximum possible behind Hamlin Street homes

2. Option M adversely impacts traffic (increases it). The bridge should stay as is. Consider other options of tunneling.
3. This option not acceptable.

#### Feedback on TDM and transit modeling assumptions

Precious little consideration has been given to the Montlake community's insistence that every effort be taken to keep from significantly managing traffic flow on Montlake Blvd.

#### Other Comments

The Alternative proposal 5 (Dubman) has merit and should be incorporated as a new alternative for discussion and consideration.

---

#### *Comment # 15*

##### 6-Lane

1. Good choice.
2. Wider Montlake Bridge is OK. Do NOT take homes.

##### 8-Lane

1. Do NOT raise the freeway through Montlake. That will increase the noise levels too much. All of the options with increased flows are going to be too noisy.

#### Other Comments

Why, after listening for 4 years, and participating in session after session, were so many of us surprised by the overall width increases. 96" for 4 lanes? Amazing. Either we've been dumb as rocks, or it wasn't discussed.

---

#### *Comment # 16*

##### Potential Lid Locations

All of these will lead to + feedback – more concrete, more cars, less useable land.

#### Other Comments

We should have an MCC meeting to discuss bored tunnel option.

---

#### *Comment # 17*

##### 6-Lane

1. Explore new all-tunnel option
2. Same as #1.

##### 8-Lane

1. Same as #1 and #2.
- 

#### *Comment # 18*

##### Other Comments

Explore new option!

---

## Appendix C, Participant and Project Team Sign-In

Participants	
Name	Affiliation
Albert, John	
Allen, Frank	
Argus, Don	CUCAC, MCC
Aschenbach, Hans	Advisory Committee
Baker, Marcia	
Blahut, Greg	
Bosch, Jerry	
Bryant, Chris & Jasmine	
Budnik, Elaine	
Campbell, Colin	
Cooper, Maurice	Madison Park C.C.
Davis, Pat	
Deeter, John	
Dolf, Beatrice	
Dubman, Jonathan	
Dunn, Richard	
Dupree, Jillon	
Fales, Ken	MCC
Fligner, Corinne	
Heller, Tom	
Iverson, Scott	
Jajewski, David	
Kearnes, Jim	MCC
Kwatinetz, Andrew	
Lampe, Matt	NCHNA
Lee, Flora	
Leed, Jean	
Leibovitz, Robert	
Leonard, Steve	
Marshall, Pete	Parks and Recreation Department
Meredith, Bob	
Meredith, Carolyn	
Nablstrom, Dorothy	
Norton, Janie	
O'Neill, Melissa	
Park, Mary	
Paulsell, Fred	
Pechmagre, Ines & Robert	
Pelroy, Gretchen	NOAA Fisheries (NWFSC)
Quinn, Lisa	University of Washington
Schuyler, William	

Stark, Don	
Staten, Peter	
Stenkamp, Ron	
Warne, John	
Warne, Patricia	
Weed, Mark A.	Advisory Committee
Weiner, Jeff	
Wood, Jeff	MCC
<b>Project Team</b>	
Cannon, Jennifer	EnviroIssues
Farquharson, Jane	Sound Transit
Goldenberg, Joy	EnviroIssues
Hoff, Brad	EnviroIssues
Horntvedt, Michael	Parametrix
Parker, Lorie	CH2M Hill
Peacock, Jeff	Parametrix
Phillips, Brad	Parametrix
Rubstello, Les	WSDOT
Scheibe, Mark	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Serie, Pat	EnviroIssues
Wilcox, Kirk	Parametrix

JHG